



An Appendix to Para-Progressivism

In a Consistent Progressive society, any and all forms of conservatism would be entirely prohibited to the fullest extent as the structures of decentralization put in place would spontaneously adapt, giving progressives several choices of force to ensure support of the concept never again forges itself into existence.

This means conservative ideas and structures such as the family institution (which alone is responsible for several forms of conservatism including, but not limited to: existence time centric slavery, eugenicism, persecution & stigmatization of individual interactions centered around how long those involved happen to have existed for, genocide, conditioned suicide, and conservative authority-obedience camps posing as educational institutions, among many more), identity medicalism/fakeclaiming, patriarchy, centralism/statism, and purity culture, (just to list a few) would be gone; entirely prohibited from existing through both decentralization and the abolition of the conservative mindset that brings them into existence to begin with.

The Consistent Progressive radqueer platform for liberation of paraphilias extends beyond intra/chronophilias (i.e. MAPs/YAPs & AAMs/AAYs) and consanguinamory/incest (the liberation of both paras being necessitated with the abolition of the family institution) however, as progressivism validates *all* identities. All queers, regardless of TransID, romantic orientation, or sexuality are welcomed and accepted within the ideology of Consistent Progressivism.

A paraphilia is itself just a term for a sexuality (philia is a term that quite literally just refers to the concept of love; i.e. having a gay identity could be described to the same effect as a 'homophilia')

that just so happens to have the unique empirical status of being extensively persecuted and outcast by conservative society, hence the modifier term of para. Special empirical attention is given to paraphilias by Consistent Progressivism because of this empirical status, as they happen to be more persecuted and targeted by conservatives, consequently rendering those with para identities to feel more ostracized and alone if they have yet to discover progressivism as they are under the constant threat of genocide, having resulted from a seemingly never-ending trend of queers betraying each other to appease conservatives (who, being conservatives, want queer identities as a whole to become extinct), resulting in more & more identities being left behind; thrown under the bus by other queers desperately grasping to be seen as tolerable by those following an ideology centered around their extinction.

A very long trend of queers not wanting to be like *‘those other “problematic” queers’* that were left behind has created entire categories of stigmatized queer identities trying to bind with what remains of each other in a very messy and unorganized cluster of identities and communities trying to rebuild what has long since been torn down and lost to conservative appeasements. All the ‘blankqueer’ communities (most prominent among them being radqueers), communities built for support of specific paraphilias, and individual TransID safe spaces are but some of the microeffects of a much larger cause, that being the continual trend of conservative appeasements, which the disorganization of the remaining splinters of scattered persecuted queers even occasionally fall victim to, as can be seen with anti-contacts and conversion therapy advocates.

Rather than reflecting the “every-last-one-of-you-needs-to-go-extinct” energy from the consistent conservatives back at all conservatives as a whole, these queers have instead

decided to look to the conservatives, copy the methods they advocated aimed at “converting” queers out of their identity under the fallacy that this is somehow “getting them help”, and repackage it to use against other queers. That would be when they aren’t just going to the full extent of repurposing the conservative extinction-energy at other queers, which is also very frequent.

An overarching theme amongst all of this is a lack of organization and structure; these queers have no cohesive platform, so in desperation they turn to inconsistent conservatism. “Persecute *these* queers for being ‘*problematic*’, but leave **our** identities alone”. That is the message spewed by these inconsistent conservatives; which specific queers they want persecuted is always entirely random, but the theme remains the same among all who turn to conservative appeasements: “draw an arbitrary line at whose identities are welcomed **somewhere**”.

It is often the case that they themselves can't even explain why they put it there to begin with; oftentimes individuals will toe the line for conservatives and take an impossible "centrist" position, which further inquiry into reveals that they only chose it because what they supposedly didn't accept about a given identity was simply that it quite literally didn't happen to also be ***their*** identity. Those who know how to see through the conservative smokescreens will very often find that conservatives- even the inconsistent ones, ***very*** frequently and glaringly say the quiet part out loud.

Behind *many* layers of smokescreens, acts of betrayal due to appeasements, and blaringly obvious self-hatred and disregard for the identities of fellow queer victims of conservatism, lies a mindset of desperation for acceptance so fueled by pure selfishness that it actively views all identities other than its own as an expendable springboard to said acceptance; able to be backstabbed and put down at the drop of a hat if the identity ever just so happens to

be the arbitrary one chosen by conservatives to be the unlucky “degen of the day”. At the core of all the concessions given to conservatism are some very desperate queers who have gone so far into self-hatred that they actively sabotage each other in order to please individuals whose central goal is total queer extinction.

It should come then as no surprise that those following a mindset so drowned in bitterness, desperation, and utter disregard for other queers would turn to the mindset of conservatism to propel themselves; all the fundamentals for the conservative mindset were already planted there for them from the start.

And planted there by none other than the very individuals they’re trying to appeal to that want them extinct: conservatives. Conservative infiltration of queer movements has become a lot more glaring empirically with the rise of identity fakeclaiming and

“LGB rights” proponents, but conservatives go far beyond merely trying to strip away the intrinsic diversity inherent to freedom of identity; they also try to rewrite the history of progressivism itself, with the goal of making the inconsistent conservatives completely oblivious to the fact that all the “problematic weird pedo queers” they threw under the bus have been here since the very beginning in queer unity movements via “pederasty”.

The fact that such conservative infiltrations have been able to go forth to any degree whatsoever, let alone to a degree where they’re trying to rewrite history itself, exposes the most glaring hurdle that the remaining splinters of persecuted queer communities have to get over: a near total lack of any cohesion, organization, or structure at all. All of the blankqueer communities, paraphile corners, and TransID safe spaces share one other thing in common aside from being left behind by other queers, and it’s that they lack any sense of structure or unity with even *each other*. They’re

splintered and spread out with no true guiding platform to follow to bring them any closer to the abolition of conservatism.

This is where Consistent Progressivism comes about- progressivism *is* that platform; a distinct, clear, cohesive, and rigid ideology to follow that brings together all the queer identities in a unified structure based entirely on queer acceptance fueled by anti-conservatism and bringing a definitive end to any and all discourse regarding who gets to be accepted and who doesn't with a clear, uncompromising, and fixed stationary answer: **all** are accepted except for conservatives.

Consistent Progressivism takes the “every-last-one-of-you-needs-to-go-extinct” energy that conservatives so keenly and proudly spout at queers and returns it to sender, aiming that exact same energy and then some at all who follow conservatism

while lifting up fellow queers out of the dark they've been so deeply trapped in for so long.

1: The Three Fundamental Rights

Family abolitionism establishes the groundwork for a liberation thesis, which paraphile & TransID liberation expands upon in order to construct the fundamental building core of the progressive platform that is the three fundamental rights of progressivism: Freedom of Identity, Bodily Autonomy, and Free Love. With Freedom of Identity being the core from which the others are built, Bodily Autonomy expanding on Freedom of Identity to create a grounds for consent based on the progressive VSR structure, and Free Love being the fullest extent of that right to Bodily Autonomy whilst also an extension of Freedom of Identity; all three of these rights respectively expand and build on each other, and are the definitive three exclusive rights in Consistent Progressivism as a whole.

Freedom of Identity being the root as all beings possess a right to identify and affirm said identity in any way they happen to desire upon themselves; this is the right of all beings to their TransIDs and universal affirmation of such, which the right to Bodily Autonomy expands upon, as vital to affirmation of identity is the ability to do as one wishes to one's own body and to not have anything done to their body that lies outside of their own desires; this creates a groundwork for consent via the Consistent Progressive structure of VSRs (Voluntary Social Relations), which would replace all relations predicated on some form of conservatism (i.e. the family institution, education, etc) and which all progressives would be able to freely join and remain in so long as all involved find that it suits their desires, with all involved maintaining the freedom to opt-out of any VSR unchallenged. This leads to the right of Free Love among beings, both sexually & romantically and with any beings they so desire with the only condition being that it happens via VSR relations with other beings who have opted-in; it can

be with any being or number of beings of any identity so long as they have opted-in to the VSR.

2: Right Applicability & BWUls

With these fundamental rights established, it then can be explained where their applicability comes in; this itself can be derived from the rights: they self-imply applicability to any progressive possessing the ability to communicate in some form. They are applied specifically to Consistent Progressives for the reason that conservatives, by virtue of being conservatives, are already excluded from the start; the very fundamental core of conservatism existing goes against all three of the rights- the rights are not being “stripped” or “revoked” from conservatives, but rather they never applied to conservatives to begin with. The entire existence of conservatism is opposed to the rights as are the rights opposed to conservatives existing; conservatives and rights are mutually exclusive.

What is also self-implied by the rights is applicability to those capable of performing an autonomous physical movement of some kind aiming towards expressing some message or desire they happen to hold (the definition of 'communication'), which can take multiple forms; speech is the most common and direct among them, but not the only form of communication, as methods such as writing and body movements would also fit this criteria if a message can be mutually deducted from it.

Those entirely incapable of expressing any communication of any kind are given the unique status of being "BWUIs", said status being solely defined by their total lack of any communication. BWUIs are the only ones other than conservatives incapable of joining VSRs, but unlike conservatives this is not because of being prohibited. Quite the opposite actually; nothing externally stops BWUIs from joining VSRs at all; they are free to join at any point they desire.

Which in order to do, requires them to make the others in the VSR aware of the existence of said desire in some way, which requires the BWUI to **communicate** the existence of said desire, which, if the BWUI was able to do, would mean that they were not a BWUI, as the status of being a BWUI is dependent solely on total lack of communication.

BWUIs are essentially prima facie assumed by default to not be joining any VSRs (as no one has any way of knowing if they even want to join to begin with due to them not being able to communicate) until they do something to indicate the contrary that they actually do indeed want to join, and thus consequently negate the BWUI status by communicating.

As far as right applicability goes for BWUIs, this is largely dependent on the empirical variable of whether the status of being a BWUI for a given individual happens to be permanent or not; most individuals who enter the BWUI status usually do so for a very short and temporary period of time (i.e. newborns or being in a

coma), with it being the case that they either sometime prior communicated what should be done with them or are in a state of it being inevitable that communication will become available to them, thus rendering the rights of progressivism to still apply to them on this communication basis; however, because not being able to communicate means no one knows if they want to join VSRs, this essentially renders the temporary BWUIs incapable of being moved or interacted with in almost any way.

However, there are still a very specific set of actions that can be engaged in (by any individual at any time due to not requiring VSRs, so no one could be restricted from them) with BWUIs, as none of them require long-term interaction (i.e. providing them with sustenance/food and material aimed towards educating them on how to engage in communication), ensuring that BWUIs remain being able to continue to the point where they can indeed communicate.

In essence, rights are still applied to BWUIs on the

grounds that they at some point cease to be BWUIs and communicate; this is the same basis used for the consent structure of VSRs. If someone is a BWUI *permanently* however, the outcome would be drastically different for them; being a *permanent* BWUI essentially renders the individual in a permanent state of being stationary and motionless, never able to move or do anything ever again for the rest of existence; at this point they are essentially the equivalent of being dead or an inanimate object: forever and fully incapable of any sort of autonomous action. Rights are not at all applied to permanent BWUIs for the reductio ad absurdum that if they were, rights would similarly have to be applied to inanimate objects (as they also share permanent BWUI status), which would include air and soil, thus rendering anything that exists into a perpetual state of violation of the rights of something else; applying rights to permanent BWUIs cannot be done with any coherency without rendering the very act of existing to be impossible.

As such, this would conclude with conservatives and permanent BWUls/inanimate objects as the only ones that definitively do not have any rights, thus allowing anything to be done with them by progressives; this provides a definitive groundwork for the liberation of necrophilia, as dead individuals would also be rendered permanent BWUls.

2.1: Animal Rights?

In regards to zoophilia, liberation for zoos can already be established through the communication basis, but this does require establishing a groundwork for how exactly progressive rights can apply to animals to begin with; this is simple enough in the case of therians & otherkin, who can communicate, but it remains empirically the case that the vast majority of animals will have more difficulty with communication than those who are not animals, which is further complicated with that most animals regularly kill and eat each other.

The communication consent basis of Consistent Progressive VSRs can be applied here quite simply in saying rights are not applying to the specific animals that are going out of their way to attack non-animals or other animals; should animals indeed have rights then it would be the case that these ones are violating each other, thus cancelling themselves out.

Animals in domestication then would be shown to be of the caliber in which rights can be applicable to; these specific animals do not attack other beings and a communication can be built with them with experience, allowing for these animals to express varying desires albeit with a more limited range of expression than most non-animals due to their communication being limited to body movements.

It may very well be the case that more careful deliberation would be needed with animal communication for interpreting their communicated

desires, but those desires would still be communicated nonetheless; this gives animals (specifically, domesticated ones, alongside therians and otherkin) the ability to enter VSRs, and subsequently, applicability for the rights of progressivism.

3: Production, Factories, Farms, & Food

It should be noted that this does not mean the concept of meat or structures such as farms and pets would disappear completely in Consistent Progressivism, but it would be reasonable to expect small reductions in the production of such, given that all relations ever would be structured through VSRs.

This merely means that rather than mass factory production maintained via conservative centralism, there is instead a Consistent Progressive structure of decentralization that would encapsulate any & all production, allowing for there to be VSR farming, with the concept of having 'pets' changed entirely with the VSR structure now having domestic animals viewed as

friends and companions rather than livestock to be owned.

Meat production would now be most frequently done with the remaining animals that are still going out of their way to attack other beings, given that in doing that they canceled themselves out of having rights; because this empirically is a great many of them, it can be expected that the reduction in meat production would be relatively miniscule given that only animals that communicate with other beings would not be able to be eaten (outside of in VSRs, given that voluntary cannibalism would similarly be permissible), all non-communicating animals would remain unchanged in this regard, though it would still be encouraged to care for them if they pose no threat to other individuals, even if they can't join VSRs.

Hunting would also remain, even if reduced due to only being able to be done on non-communicating animals; hunting for food or sport would much more

frequently be done instead on conservatives, who could be repurposed in a large variety of ways, such as ashes for production via being incinerated, or being food; a progressive society could very well choose to switch to an all-conservative diet, in which case there would be no reduction at all in the production of meat; quite the contrary as the production would heavily increase given that the extent of food and conditioning of such would be unrestricted if sourced from conservatives; alongside which could exist vegetarian & vegan VSRs, which would be aligned with other environmental-oriented VSRs to grow decentralized gardening structures.

Production as a whole would be moved to decentralized VSR structures in progressivism, as all relations would be requiring that all involved remain only insofar as they find it suits their desires and are unchallenged from opting-out should they find it to not; this would allow for the decentralization of resources and for mutual agreements to be reached

regarding accumulation and distribution, considering that actions could only go forth once all involved were satisfied with the outcome.

Paired with task division, horizontal organization, and the total nonexistence of any central planning or centralism, this essentially would allow for efficiency to the point of spontaneity, as individual VSR divisions would be able to adapt and communicate with each other, no longer having to wait for approval from the centralist to move forward with any given project.

Deprogramming Conservative Language

This is contrasted with centralism, which is requiring that the connection and organization of all the divisions be subjected to a singular hierarchy of command, having to wait for the command of the centralist to know if, what, when, and how to produce anything, not only rescinding autonomy but resulting in a concentration of resource accumulation by the centralist, who has taken said resources from all those

viewed as “lower” in the hierarchy.

This, like many structures of conservatism, is described with a large multitude of names: “rent”, “taxation”, “wage labor”, etc. The process of what is happening remains the same in each: centralists viewing themselves as having some intrinsic “right” to resources gained by those whose identities are viewed as “lower” by the centralist.

This however is far from being the only case of conservatives obfuscating concepts using language; in fact, control over language is by far the strongest tool conservatives have at their disposal, as it is used to bake double-meanings, contradictions, and conservative structures right into the very language used regularly by individuals.

Of all the continuous terms conservatives have injected their incoherencies into, economic spectacle would be the least egregious of them all, as it just so

happens to be the distraction chosen by conservatives of nearly all kinds to smokescreen that “problematic pedo queers” will continue to be persecuted and genocided, regardless of what method of production happens to be deployed in a given society.

Those with an extensive focus towards economics will always tend towards conservatism, as liberation is to them viewed as a secondary (at best) or nonexistent concern to what happens to “money”, “property”, and “means of production”.

Conservatives bake their incoherencies into so many facets of language that explicitly listing all of them would be nearly impossible, but a universal solution can be made to identifying them, that being to deprogram conservative language.

Conservatives hold a stronghold over language and maintain it by programming language in a number of ways; the first and most harmful among them being

double-meanings.

1: Double-Meanings & Contradictions

A lot of terms used have had double (or multiple) unrelated or directly contradictory meanings injected into them by conservatives; this works to maintain the conservative stronghold over language as because of the double-meanings injected into the terms, conservative incoherencies are reaffirmed every time the terms are used, *even if those using the terms had no intention of doing so*. “Age” and “family” are two of the most common and harmful examples of this.

1.1: “Age”

At the root of the concept of “age” is the amount of time a given individual has existed for. That is the most direct, distinct, and clear definition of the term “age”: “the duration of time someone has existed”.

Yet conservatives, using their stronghold over language, have programmed the term to have multiple

unrelated meanings; when the term “age” is used and described among the general populace, conservatives have programmed it to mean “the amount of time someone has existed for”, **and** “the numerical degree of intelligence possessed by an individual over an arbitrary concept”, **and** “the point of physical evolutionary advancement possessed by the body”, **and** “the aesthetical degree of diligence expressed via actions and appearance”, despite none of these having any relation to one another in any way whatsoever.

Conservatives not only bundle all of these unrelated concepts using the term “age”, but then go on to draw numerical hierarchies of autonomy based on where one happens to fall, with conservatives using the initial and actual definition (the duration of time one has existed for) as the basis for how they measure all of the other unrelated concepts they dumped in, with the end result they arrive at being the logic of “if one has existed for a long time, that therefore also means that individual has intrinsically advanced in intelligence,

evolution, and possesses a high degree of aesthetic diligence”, despite none of these having to do with each other.

This, like all other forms of conservatism, is completely inconsistent, as conservatives will begin revoking autonomy from individuals and viewing them as “lesser” if they happen to exist for *too long*, which conservatives bundle with unrelated concepts of fragility and obsolescence.

This however is a far cry from the treatment of those who they view as not having existed *long enough*, as these individuals have their autonomy revoked entirely and are fully reduced to the point of slaves, unable to act or engage in any interactions of any kind without the approval of a slave owner.

This, all because of being viewed as “underage”, a concept which is reaffirmed every time the term “age” is used due to the amount of unrelated meanings

conservatives have bundled with it.

Not only do conservatives bundle unrelated concepts into the term “age” however, but they also assign classes based on these unrelated concepts to individuals determined by where conservatives happen to have placed them on their arbitrary scales; “adult” being one of the terms they use for those that they have placed high enough on the scale to be deserving of basic autonomy, and “child”, “kid”, and “minor” being some of the *many* terms used to refer to the slaves who happen to have not existed long enough for any of the unrelated concepts that conservatives have bundled together using the term “age” to also happen to apply to them, despite the fact that all of them are determined by entirely arbitrary factors, none of which having anything to do with how long one has existed for.

“Age” is a singular term, and yet through the conservative stronghold over language being used to

inject several unrelated meanings into it, it has been transformed into a term that any usage of reaffirms the false conservative notion of existence time being linked to the deserving of autonomy. Along with the multiple meanings leaking out and infecting several other terms that now *also* reaffirm this conservative notion if they are used by drawing distinctions between individuals based on unrelated conditionals determined by conservatives, such as “adult”, “child”, and “minor”.

“Minor” being the most direct and insulting among them, considering the actual definition of it is quite literally “small”; conservatives use this term to inject their notions about those who have yet to reach the arbitrary duration of existence conservatives require for basic autonomy in plain sight: that they are *smaller* and *inferior* to those above it.

“Child” being a term with similar but entirely new injections, as conservatives will also use terms like

“child” and “kid” as adjectives to describe appearance and actions based on the multiple meanings they injected into the term “age”: that an individual who happens to look or act in a specific way that conservatives view as “degenerate” is now looking or acting “like a child” or “childish”, as though doing these specific things *even if the individual in question happens to have surpassed the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy*, causes the individual to lower themselves to the status of those who have not, despite appearance, actions, and existence time having no relation to one another whatsoever.

Conservative notions have even been injected into the term “adult” because of the multiple meanings injected into the term “age”, despite “adult” being the term they use to refer to those they think deserve basic barebones autonomy. The multiple meanings injected into the term “adult” happen to be of the categorization sort, with conservatives using “adult” to describe anything involving interactions or media that

those under the existence time criteria for autonomy have been restricted from having any involvement in; this can range from anything involving something sexual, anything involving firearms or drinks, anything involving violence, or even things as simple as existing in a certain place at a certain time, or gaining access to knowledge that conservatives have decided the slaves do not deserve to know.

Anything that exists that conservatives want slaves to have nothing to do with is categorized as “adult”, which is the same term used to refer to those who have existed beyond the existence time criteria for autonomy; any usage of this term only reaffirms the conservative categorization of such and the notion of such a distinction to begin with.

1.2: “Family”

Another term that conservatives have injected double-meanings into is the term “family”; there are many conservatives that pride themselves on being

zealous advocates of “family”, but what specifically is meant when they say that is vastly different from what an unknowledgeable good-faith individual means in casual conversation.

In this specific case, the correct definition of “family” can be analyzed quite easily from the very individuals advocating it: conservatives.

That is, when one can see through all the smokescreens they put up and observe what it is that they actually want, which can be properly described as a “societal institution formed when two individuals reproduce and one of them gives birth to offspring, said offspring then being involuntarily forced into the institution at the instant they exist where they will be subject to the hierarchical ruling granted within such an institution to one or more individuals, usually though not always delineated by genetic code, that are considered to be the ruling authorities who are granted the power to complete and total control over

every aspect of the lives, identities, and actions of the offspring, who never even chose to enter the institution nor is permitted to opt-out on the basis of their existence time in that they have not existed long enough (which is determined arbitrarily by the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy), and who upon being forced into the institution, is then, whether they like it or not, forced to obey the every whim of said authorities lest they face persecution”.

Such an institution can very easily be described as slavery once its actual definition is revealed, but conservatives have used their stronghold over language to inject double-meanings into this term as well, such that it now means “eugenicist slavery with extra steps” **and** “a voluntary gathering and/or community of individuals who share a strong bond with each other”.

These two meanings are not only unrelated but are in fact directly contradictory with each other; they are

mutually exclusive concepts yet conservatives have bundled them together under the singular term of “family”. In this case any usage of the term to refer to the latter is what reaffirms conservatism, as conservatives who strongly advocate the term do so in support of the former.

To the untrained mind, observing the term “family” being advocated and described as the latter at face value would make the term seem like something acceptable, which conservatives will then use their stronghold over language to exploit, misleading people into supporting the former under the guise that they are supporting the latter.

Alongside the fact that just like the term “age”, the conservative double-meaning injection into the term “family” leaks out into other terms that reaffirm the conservative notion of the legitimacy of owning another person as though they were a slave; the terms in this case being terms like “parents”, “adoption”, and

“custody”, among many others.

Anything involving the term “parent” in it quite literally referring to the ruling authorities present in the slavery institution, as the term is quite literally used synonymously with hierarchical connotations of ownership and superiority (think terms like “parent company”), which is only further reaffirmed when conservatives expand the term into phrases such as “parental consent” or “parental rights”, both of which referring to the concept that a given individual has no autonomy and is in need of another individual to approve things for them, identical to that of a slave owner.

“Adoption” being an even worse term as it refers to the concept of a “parent”/slave owner abandoning the ownership of their slave so that it can be taken up by another individual seeking to be a slave owner; any usage of this term *also* reaffirms the conservative notion of the legitimacy of slavery, as individuals not having reached the conservative existence time criteria

for autonomy are being viewed as so deprived of said autonomy that they cannot even exist without being under the ruling ownership of another individual to “raise” them, “raise” being another term with double-meanings injected into it, the one referred to by conservatives being “reaching a plateau of being ruled over by the slave owner”, with the definition they use to smokescreen it as being merely to “guide/educate”.

“Custody” being the most direct and harmful of the terms, which conservatives seem to have not even made an attempt to hide the slavery meaning of, as it quite literally refers to the status of ownership over another individual; custody refers to the incarnate concept of slavery itself, but the conservative double-meanings injected into so many other terms have obscured the concepts to such an extent that they can nearly refer to their slavery as what it is in plain sight with no one batting an eye; this is the extent that the conservative stronghold over language

can go to.

That of course couldn't be the end of it however, as conservatives have also repurposed their double-meanings into verbs; individuals saying they want to "have kids/a family" and referring to said individuals as "my kids" also reaffirm the conservative notions of slavery in a much more direct manner, as this time they are actively participating in the desired continuation of the slavery institution by conservatives, proudly expressing (via the use of a possessive modifier term) their excitement over being able to hold ownership over another individual in the future.

Control over language is the most powerful tool conservatives have, as "age" and "family" are by themselves merely **two** words that conservatives have injected incoherencies into, yet the commonality and usage of these two words has caused a domino effect of conservatism into several other terms and concepts that have nothing to do with the actual definitions of

the terms, and has caused it to be such that any usage of these terms and the terms that the conservatism injected into them has leaked to are now reaffirming conservatism, even if the individual using the terms has no desire to do so.

2: Obscuration

Double-meanings are just *one* way conservatives use their stronghold over language however as there are many terms with which they don't even need to inject multiple meanings into; for these simply obscuring what the actual meaning is to begin with is more than enough; conservatives have done this with terms such as “liberal”, “left-wing”/“right-wing”, and pretty much any term that happens to be the name of an economic system.

2.1: “Liberal”

“Liberalism” is a term that refers to an ideology in favor of statism based on the “social contract” fallacy, the continued existence of the slavery institution, gender

binaries, and hierarchical organization structures. Such an ideology can fairly easily be described as a conservative ideology, regardless of how many rainbows they try to paint their structures in. However, the conservative stronghold over language has been used here for obscuration tactics; liberals trying to compete with other conservatives to see who gets to be on top of the statism hierarchy has been transformed through conservative language as though these liberals are somehow *fighting* the conservatives; liberalism, despite being a very much conservative ideology, is painted through the conservative stronghold over language as the antidote to conservatism, despite liberals desiring more of it.

Conservatives running for a spot in a conservative institution against other conservatives can accurately be described as merely conservative infighting, but the conservative stronghold over language is used to mislead unknowing individuals into thinking an actual effort for liberation is being made here, when it is

actually the case that no matter who is in charge of the state, statism/government existing as a whole will remain a form of conservatism.

None of this would be known to those unable to see past the mainstream perspective however, as the conservative infighting has been obscured through the many labels assigned to different types of conservatives as if they were somehow distinct from the whole of conservatism when they very much are not.

A similar case can be made for the terms “libertarianism” and “anarchism”, both of which suffer from similar problems but have those arise from an entirely different tactic used by conservatives: the tactic of big-tent dilution. At their core conception, both “libertarianism” and “anarchism” are supposed to be terms directly synonymous with progressivism but bearing more emphasis on the decentralization aspect of it; both of these terms are supposed to be defined

quite simply as “decentralization”.

However, though the conservative stronghold over language use of big-tent dilution, the meanings of both terms have been dialed down and obscured to include things that were never supposed to be part of the definition; “libertarian” now being diluted via big-tent politics to include minarchism and even liberalism, both of which are conservative ideologies, and “anarchy” being obscured entirely through a combination of double-meanings and dilution; now having no distinct universal meaning, being “no hierarchies” to some camps, “no rulers” to other camps, “just no state” to another, and “total chaos” to the conservatives injecting the multiple meanings; conservative terminology obscuration is used the most when it comes to these terms.

2.2: “Left”/“Right”

“Left-wing” and “right-wing” are terms that have been even more obscured by conservatives; so much so to

the point where no singular cohesive definition can be deducted from them at all; it's entirely arbitrary and dependent on who is being asked, which is not the environment that a term as vague as a literal direction should be in when said term is used so commonly by so many. Whenever one does manage to squeeze out some semblance of a definition of these terms however, it is usually reduced to a false dichotomy of axes, being "economic" and "cultural". This is a false dichotomy because the "cultural" one is usually used to refer to the actual dichotomy of conservatism and progressivism, but is seldom the one being referred to, with the more common usage of the term going to the economic axis, which always devolves back into being entirely arbitrary and dependent on interpretation.

That paired with that many kinds of conservatives will claim different sides of the "left" vs "right" dichotomy, this ultimately renders any attempt to refer to such a dichotomy in reference to the actual dichotomy a futile one, as conservatives will be found calling themselves

“left” and “right”, which were already vague terms to begin with, thus making there no reason to use them at all.

2.3: Economic Terms

Which ties into the ultimate culprit behind the ambiguity of these terms: the aforementioned economic distraction. Conservatives of all kinds want progressives to have infighting on trivial concepts such as economics, as this helps conservatives continue existing unchallenged while progressives are too busy fighting each other over what system should be called what. No terms exist that are more vital to the continued existence of such pointlessness than “capitalism”, “socialism”, and “communism”. The three giant terms that are thrown around constantly, each one of them as vague as the others with not a tablespoon of a coherent definition able to be found for any of them, and each used so frequently that advocates of all three almost always tend to be conservatives hiding in plain sight.

All three of these terms along with any other terms that happen to relate to economics do leave behind a small modicum of helpful information to be parsed by progressives however: anyone overly focused on these terms is quite clearly someone with little to no care for the genuine liberation of queer beings, and thus should be immediately disregarded if this is anywhere even close to their primary focus; they are a conservative timebomb and should be treated as such.

3: Misdefinitions

Then there are terms that conservatives use their stronghold over language to just misdefine entirely; no double-meanings or obscurations needed, just simply taking a term, assigning an incorrect definition to it, and going about as if that were the definition of the term when it clearly is not. This is not something conservatives do in a vacuum however; it works in tandem with the double-meanings, contradictions, and obscurations to finalize notions of conservatism after

the former methods had already been put in place to set up smokescreens; the two major terms the misdefinition tactic is used with being “pedophilia” and “conservatism” itself.

3.1: Misdefinition 1 of the Big 3

“Pedophilia” is a term thrown around a lot by conservatives, but the consistent misdefinition of such only has any effect because of the preconceived notions put in place by the conservative stronghold of language already having injected multiple meanings into the term “age”.

Pedophilia is one of many intra/chronophilias (which themselves are just sexualities determined by a given point in existence or self-identified feeling with such held by an individual), with pedophilia being a very specific one aimed towards an approximation of three to ten anniversaries of existence.

The conservative existence time criteria for basic

autonomy is always entirely arbitrary, but you'd empirically seldom find any conservative inconsistent enough to set the bar for when people aren't considered slaves as much as ten years of existence.

Along with that it should go without question that those yet to reach three years of existence are still considered slaves in conservatism, a status which remains identical and unchanging in the slightest upon surpassing the time period of three years.

Yet despite these glaring holes in the thesis, conservatives have proceeded to misdefine "pedophilia", broadening it to now encapsulate any individual holding an attraction to any individual who has yet to reach the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy (which is pretty much always *far* beyond ten years of existence).

This works in tandem with the conservative injections of multiple meanings into the term "age", which leaks

out into the conservative misdefinition of “pedophilia” as now, anything involving anything sexual with an individual who has yet to reach the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy is now considered “pedophilia” and erroneously seen as synonymous with “rape”, despite once again both terms having nothing to do with each other.

This may bring into question what happens if an individual who has yet to reach the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy is involved in something sexual that undeniably could not possibly have been rape; mayhaps they explicitly opted-in to the relation. The answer is that conservatives will view it as synonymous to rape anyway, because they’ve injected double-meanings into that as well; “rape” is now “sexual interaction with an individual who did not opt-in to such” **and** “sexual content involving an individual who has yet to reach arbitrary x years of existence”, despite these two concepts having nothing to do with each other.

It's made as painstakingly clear as possible that the individual has clearly opted-in and enjoys being there? Conservatives will call that "statutory rape". They will abuse whatever terms they can find to try to inject as much conservatism into them as possible, with the end result being entirely incoherent every single time.

What is most bizarre about this misdefinition is that it was not even necessary; the actual definition of "pedophilia" is still aimed at individuals conservatives would consider slaves, and there are terms for other intra/chronophilias similarly aimed at slaves that many conservatives have since become unaware of the existence of (i.e. nepiophilia, hebephilia, ephebophilia), yet "pedophilia" is the specific intra/chronophilia conservatives have chosen to misdefine and stigmatize, further emphasizing and highlighting how arbitrary and random the conservative autonomy delineations are: there did not exist a term to refer to a sexuality aimed at "everyone that exists that hasn't

existed for arbitrary x number of years to gain basic autonomy”, so rather than at the very least having the originality to make one up, they decided to just take the term of some random intra/chronophilia that was already there and misdefine it to mean that in order to reinforce the conservative double-meanings they injected into the term “age” and the notions of slavery that follow from it which they advocate.

When it is revealed how the nature of the conservative mindset works, with contradictions at every corner, one would think that the nature of logic itself would have stopped conservatism from getting very far long ago, but against all odds and possible rules of logic, these tactics of total incoherency actually worked, with conservatives managing to turn “pedophilia” and anything associated with the term into a sensitive buzzword, aided by the conservative double-meanings injected into the term “age”.

All that was left to do at this point was stigmatize,

persecute, and advocate genocide of anyone they randomly labeled as a “pedo”, which they did, further reinforcing their slavery institutions and fostering a society in which many queers hold fear of even being seen anywhere near an individual having yet to reach the conservative existence time criteria for autonomy, lest they too face persecution by the slavery institution, the state, and the many mobs of conservatives coming together with the singular goal of genociding anyone labeled as a “pedo”.

The “pedo” label is the only label conservatives have put more injections into than “age” and “family”, as it is the one they weaponize the most against queers and lies at the core of all the betrayals and conservative appeasements that have torn down the queer movements: they don’t want to be seen as “pedos”, despite that “pedos”, both by the actual definition and the incoherent conservative one, have been with queer liberation movements from the very beginning.

The conservatives wouldn't have completed their stronghold over language however, if they didn't misdefine the core term used to point them out, that being "conservatism" itself.

The actual definition of conservatism is "a political worldview defined by a broad category of ideas either implicitly or explicitly believing that people should be discriminated against because of their race, gender identity, pronouns, sexual identity, or anything else regarding their identity that does not harm others; that some humans based on some aspect of themselves that they were born with or identify as, or some physical, sexual, or personal pleasure they happen to have can be 'lesser' individuals than other individuals whom they would consider 'pure', and therefore that these 'subhumans' should be persecuted due to their identity being viewed as 'lower' than the identity of someone else a given conservative views as 'pure'".

But of course, this is nowhere to be seen by the

conservatives, as they have different terms in mind other than “bigotry”, “prejudice”, and “discrimination” for conservatism to be synonymous with. They tend not to even bother to provide a cohesive definition for “conservatism” itself, instead merely misdefining it as being synonymous with “traditionalism”/“traditional values” and/or whatever the “status quo” happens to be.

This would be a case of the conservative stronghold over language combining all three of its tactics to completely smokescreen the definition of conservatism; there is the double-meaning and contradiction of “traditionalism” and the “status quo”, despite both terms being entirely empirical and dependent on a period of time, thus incoherent to use for an ideological definition, paired with obscuration as many conservatives are indecisive on which misdefinition to even use, trapping individuals who don’t know any better into a false dichotomy of answers that are both wrong, with just that being the

misdefinition to wrap all of it up.

All three of the tactics deployed by the conservative stronghold over language are used here, creating a large and effective smokescreen over the definition of conservatism such that it's unclear what queers are even fighting against, finalizing the conservative language stronghold and allowing the true threat of conservatism to go entirely undetected as it continues to encapsulate society.

4: How to deprogram language

These are just some of *many* terms that conservatism has programmed; there are a lot more than the ones mentioned thus far and will continue to be, but these are just some of the most prominent examples.

Language is the strongest tool conservatives have, so as Consistent Progressives, it is critically and vitally important to take that tool away from them, and this is done by deprogramming it. Each of the methods that conservatives use to program language can be

counteracted via clarification.

For double-meaning terms like “age” and “family”, these can be deprogrammed by using more direct and explicit terms in place of these terms to place as much emphasis as possible on the true definition of the terms; i.e. instead of saying “age”, use a phrase with the true definition undeniably baked in like “existence time”. It may be noticed that “conservative existence time criteria for autonomy” is a phrase used multiple times throughout this; this is just one example of deprogramming conservative language being used in practice; say that instead of saying “age of [insert concept]”. If it helps for convenience purposes, deprogrammed phrases can be turned into acronyms, i.e. CETCA (**C**onservative **E**xistence **T**ime **C**riteria for **A**utonomy).

Instead of saying “family”, use a phrase with the true definition front & center like “slavery institution”.

Alternatively, some terms such as “family” can continue being used if it’s the case that it only helps

conservatism when it's used positively, so “family” can also just be called merely the “family institution” to remove the conservative artificial sense of “virtue” that their double-meaning injects into the term.

For all the terms that the conservative double-meanings domino effect into, i.e. “minor”, “adoption”, “parent”, etc, those follow the exact same process of deprogramming: replace them with phrases that emphasize their true definition, i.e. replacing “minor” and all related terms with “slaves” (or “those yet to gain basic autonomy” or some acronym of the sort if directed at a sensitive individual), “adoption”, “custody” and all related terms with “slave trade”, and “parent” with “slave owner”.

When this practice is normalized in common language, the double-meanings conservatives hold up will be made abundantly clear; most may react by just doubling-down on their conservatism, but those who actually deserve to not be incinerated will think twice about the language they use and what they're

reinforcing when they use it.

For terms that conservatives have obscured the actual meanings of, deprogramming these will follow one of three methods: 1, the same method used for double-meanings (replacing the terms with phrases that emphasize their actual definition), 2, merely clarifying what the actual definition of the term is before using it (i.e., for “liberalism”, simply specifying that it is a conservative ideology when the term is used), or 3, simply not using the term at all and finding a more coherent one (the route to take in the case of “left”/“right” and economic terms).

Method 1 should be the first option chosen; Method 2 should only be used if the term being obscured is erroneously seen as anti-conservative when it is in fact just another form of conservatism, and Method 3 should be used exclusively when the term obscured is so obscure that not even the tiniest morsel of a consistent and coherent definition can be found for it; this is essentially the last resort for terms that are so arbitrary that the definition is entirely different for

every single person whose understanding of it is asked.

To deprogram terms that conservatives have blatantly decided to just misdefine entirely, this can be done quite simply by using the term correctly the way it is supposed to be used. When this practice is normalized it will eventually become the case that curious minds inquire into your definition rather than insist on their own incorrect own, which will allow you to shed light on them and fix their terminology.

Call conservatives “conservatives”, regardless of whatever specific ideology of conservatism they follow; do not aid their smokescreen by using any other terms to refer to them (i.e. “reactionary”, “regressive”, etc).

The only time calling them even so much as a specific ideology of conservatism (i.e. liberals, minarchists, social democrats, nazis, tankies, etc) is necessary is if you are asked “what specific kind of conservative”, in which case even

here these four modifier terms should be used first before anything else: “consistent”, “inconsistent”, “intrinsic”, and “empirical”.

Furthermore, when you point out conservatives, do so with the fury of a thousand suns; always remind yourself that the continued existence of conservatives perpetuates the institutions of slavery and genocide that so many are forced to suffer under every single day; many try to escape from conservatism and very few are lucky enough to succeed. Their attempts will be painted by conservatism as slaves being kidnapped from their “rightful” place of being at the command of ruling authorities, who will send out the state (another form of conservatism) to hunt them down and bring them back whilst persecuting those who actively take steps to help these people.

Use the conservative label the same way conservatives use the “pedo” label; channel all the fury felt by the many contradictions that have caused a

countless number of suicides into the label, and then aim it at conservatives with full intent to harm.

Take the “every-last-one-of-you-needs-to-go-extinct” energy directed by conservatives at queers and “pedos”, and direct it at conservatives tenfold. *That* is how to deprogram the “conservatism” label.

As for the “pedophilia” label itself, what to do with that largely depends on the audience; define it the way it is actually defined if your audience is either progressives or very inconsistent conservatives that are worth educating, and double-down on it if the audience is regular or consistent conservatives. At its core it’s just one of many intra/chronophilias, so merely defining it correctly would be the approach to take in a vacuum, but in conservative society, almost every conservative will insist on misdefining and weaponizing it anyway, so that label would be the singular exception where doubling-down on it is an optimal approach, since even the conservative

misdefining of it has nothing intrinsically wrong with it due to only being held up by the double-meanings conservatives have injected into the term “age”.

“Rape” and most other terms conservatives have misdefined can be deprogrammed with the straightforward solution of actually using the terms correctly and not validating conservative incoherencies like “statutory rape”. Explicitly define the terms if needed.

4.1: Some terms just can't be saved

There are also some terms and phrases that are so entrenched in conservatism that no degree of deprogramming could save them, making it best to avoid these ones outright; examples of such would include pretty much any term or phrase that is used as a slur (with very few exceptions, i.e. “reclaimed”), “human nature”, and “mental disorders”.

The core of how to identify terms like this is that from their entire conception their only purpose and use is to be weaponized against queers; these are the few original terms that conservatives *did* make up (i.e. the n-word), all of which have no other reason to exist than to be derogatory.

Slurs are obvious enough; they're derogatory terms made up by conservatives intended to target queer identities. In some rare occasions conservatives will try to take existing queer identities and repurpose them as insults (which they're trying to do with "gay"), in which case deprogramming this is as simple as using the term correctly and doubling-down on it; essentially to hold pride in queer identities regardless of what conservatives say about them.

However, at the point where conservatives start to throw in the towel (essentially acknowledging they're losing and their stronghold over language is being broken down!) and start making up new words just for the sake of having

more slurs (like they've done with the n-word; the process is basically to make up a word from nowhere and define it as "black person. connotation: bad"), then at this point, when the conservatives have reached the peak of their desperation and are grasping for *anything* to use to stigmatize queer identities, 'the only winning move is not to play'.

If it's a term made up by conservatives just to be weaponized as a slur, there's no reason or point to using it ever, and doing so in any context whatsoever will only empower conservatives, who, by virtue of even feeling the need to do this, are already on the verge of losing power.

Let them and their terms die out; don't reignite them by giving them attention and use. Don't entertain their nonsense.

"Human nature" is an example of a specific conservative-entrenched term; aside from having no regard for therians and otherkin directly built into the

phrase, the phrase itself implies there is some intrinsic nature to humans, which can be fairly obviously shown to not be the case by the existence of free will.

“Human nature” conservatives throw this out entirely: by their viewpoint, your actions, decisions, identity, and mindset is not your own, but rather some predetermined circumstance of an invisible “nature” of humans.

The phrase has speciesism and a blatant disregard for the mind built right into it, making any effort for deprogramming futile here. The same goes for “mental disorder”, which has the same problems along with entirely unique ones that make it even worse.

“Mental Disorders”

“Mental disorder” is another derogatory term made up by conservatives as an attempt to justify eugenicism through the basis that some queer identities are simply a “disease to the mind” in need of being “cured”.

This term is very commonly thrown around by conservatives of the conversion therapy variety, also referred to as conservative eugenicists.

These specific conservatives would be among the most harmful, as would their methods, because the specific smokescreen they use for masking their conservatism is the erroneous guise of “science”.

Individuals who don't know any better are the most likely to trust these conservatives out of any others, as their smokescreen allows them to masquerade as “professionals” in their field, unbeknownst to the untrained individual that the specific “field” these pseudo-scientists are claiming to be “professional” in is the field of genociding queer identities.

Neurodivergent and plural individuals are usually the main targets of this, but conservative eugenicists will aim the “mental disorder” label at just about anyone with a queer identity/TransID, *especially* if it's a

paraphilia. Their goal is to force people out of their identities with pseudo-science, but because identities are something intrinsic to the self that *only* the self has any influence over, the end result is always paras, neurodivergent beings, and queer individuals as a whole being restrained to solitary confinement, under the smokescreen that these beings are “mental patients” being treated, when what is actually happening is just an excuse to imprison queer beings.

Any use of the term ““““mental disorder”””” in any context only reinforces these structures, so the only optimal route would be to avoid the term altogether, and call out anyone insisting to use it as a conservative eugenicist.

Muh “Free Speech”

There is however, of course, a pretty common recourse conservatives will dish out whenever their stronghold over language is interrogated, let alone to the proper extent of deprogramming all of it, that being that any

action taken against conservative language has now been transformed into a violation of the right to “free speech”.

“Free speech” itself being a term subject to multiple interpretations; the first course of action to take to refute this is to *deprogram the term and find out what exactly is even meant by “free speech”!* Because despite many conservatives being staunch advocates of it (or so they claim to be...), very few of them will actually use said speech to clarify what it even means.

So, the response here would be to deprogram the term and observe for oneself; deduct the definition from the context surrounding every time a conservative repeatedly spews the phrase “free speech” and find a pattern.

All of this is from empirical observation, but it will quickly dawn from the observed patterns that *intrinsically*, in every single context “free speech” is

advocated, it is *always* in defense of conservatives wanting to maintain their programmed language or spout slurs. That paired with the surrounding context of *where* this supposed right to “free speech” is advocated, tending almost always to be some public media platform.

There are several routes to take here; the first immediate one would be for conservatives of the statist and corporatist variety; they already fell into contradiction by now suddenly advocating an arbitrary restriction on what the state and its extensions should be able to do with what, according to conservative logic, they “rightfully” own; the state is supposed to be at the top of the hierarchy; where did this sudden restriction come into place?

Conservatives will never explain it. Perhaps they happen to be a “social contract” conservative and believe the state is somehow in service to people and violates said service by not having “free speech” on its

platforms, in which case it can be interrogated why exactly this counts as a violation when it's a violation of a contract no one opted-in to in the first place.

If their logic is that people agreed to it by merely existing in a certain area, then any argument in favor of “free speech” rights falls apart by virtue of their logic having now declared anyone happening to exist in a given region slaves to the state (with it being unclear how exactly the state rose to such a status where it has the supreme right to enslave people to such an extent in the first place).

The alternative route the conservative may take is the ““egalitarian”” façade, where they are claiming that the right to “free speech” is something that is universalized and universally applicable. In which case such a right would collapse in on itself, given that *true* “free speech” would ultimately be rendered an impossibility since it can be used to cancel itself out, i.e. talking to interrupt someone else talking, or the very act of discourse itself. This stance of true “free speech” absolutism ultimately self-contradicts. However, if

“free speech” is an impossibility, it poses the question as to why conservatives so often claim to be advocates of something that doesn’t even exist. The answer is that they aren’t, and they know they aren’t.

Conservatives will be quick to drop any self-proclaimed support of “free speech” when the individual in question who is talking happens to be a queer being; the “free speech” thumpers are nowhere in sight when a queer individual is being persecuted for having pronouns, or when a paraphile is being attacked for even so much as suggesting that slavery might be a bad thing.

They will however be quick to come out of the woodworks when that same energy is directed towards conservatives spamming slurs or openly advocating genocide; it’s “you shouldn’t get rid of people for having opinions” when the crosshair is pointed towards conservatives, but “send these degens to the woodchipper” when the crosshair is

reversed at progressives.

The idea of being able to say anything, anywhere, at any time, with no pushback, persecution, or repercussions of any kind likely sounds like an appealing idea, but the ultimate truth is that no one truly believes in “free speech” because the concept is self-contradictory. There is however a vital difference between conservatives and progressives despite this: progressives are honest. Conservatives are not. Progressives will not lie and pretend to support an appealing-sounding right that does not exist. Conservatives will. This is the true difference between conservatives and progressives on “free speech”.

Identity ≠ Ideology

And it is this fundamental difference that shows a stark contrast between progressive and conservative spaces; Consistent Progressives hold safe spaces that are welcome for all queer identities to join and feel accepted in, while many conservative spaces will tout

that they supposedly welcome “free speech”, political plurality, and open spaces for ideological discussion and debate.

Obvious wolf-in-sheep’s-clothing labels and the fact that all of what these conservatives tout will go out the window if a paraphile ever enters aside, it is far too common for conservatives to try to paint *progressives* as being the contradictory ones for not allowing conservatives.

Some even go to the extent of crying out “bigotry”; that progressives are being *bigoted* against the ideology of conservatism. Not knowing how to respond to such bizarre claims tends to be a one-way ticket straight to inconsistent conservatism, as those posed with phrases like this often have yet to learn how to deprogram conservative language, or are still stuck in the smoke and mirrors of the fallacy that is “free speech”.

The answer is very simplistic: political plurality was never included to begin with. When progressives say “all” are welcome, it is vitally important to clarify that “all” is in reference to queer identities; no progressive ever intends “all” to mean political plurality. Just like with rights, conservatives never counted from the start; terms like “discrimination” and “bigotry” are defined as prejudice and disdain towards *identities*. Ideologies were simply never part of the equation to begin with.

Progressives do not support political plurality, nor “free speech”, nor ideological discourse. Progressives support the acceptance and liberation of all *identities*. Sexualities. Romantic orientations. TransIDs. *That* is what is supported; a stateless decentralized society of Consistent Progressivism where no longer do individuals have to live in fear of persecution because their identity included neopronouns, or paraphilic attractions, or plurality systems.

A society where all relations have become VSRs organized on consent, decentralization, and pleasure. A society where all queer identities live together in decentralized harmony and organization, no longer having to worry about being told by some rando that they should kill themselves with a woodchipper and then being called a slur. A society where no longer are individuals enslaved due to not having existed long enough to be viewed as deserving of basic autonomy, and all start as and remain free beings from the start, with no actions taken on their body that they did not opt-in to having. A society where there are no identities or actions one can take that suddenly has them viewed as “degenerate”, and all are instead viewed as a fellow member and friend of the larger progressive community.

That is what progressives support. Quite bluntly, none of this has any room for ‘negotiations’. Consistent Progressivism only has room for **one** ideology, and that ideology is Consistent Progressivism. Any others imply

a deviation, which therefore would make them a conservative. As for the existence of conservatives, they'd be good for feeding to the VSRs.